



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/667,625	09/22/2000	Christopher Cressy	7784-001023/US	8136

65961 7590 03/26/2008  
HARNESS DICKEY & PIERCE, PLC  
P.O. BOX 828  
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER
----------

CZEKAJ, DAVID J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2621

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/26/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/667,625	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CRESSY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DAVID CZEKAJ	<b>Art Unit</b> 2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-19,21-43 and 71 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-19,21-43 and 71 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 5/11/07, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new ground of rejection is set forth below. To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

/Mehrdad Dastouri/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff (6665004) in view of Thompson (5872594).

Regarding claim 16, Paff discloses an apparatus that relates to security systems (Paff: column 1, lines 11-13). This apparatus comprises “generating a plurality of video signals corresponding to a respective view from a plurality of cameras” (Paff: figures 1 and 3, wherein each of the cameras generates a video signal, wherein the respective view is the coverage area of the camera), “generating a security device signal” (Paff: column 9, lines 15-20, wherein the security device signal is the alarm signal), “when the security device signal is generated, automatically changing a display to a first video signal in response to the security device signal” (Paff: column 14, lines 40-45, wherein once the alarm is generated, the corresponding video is displayed on the monitor), and “displaying an icon of the security device on the display corresponding to an alarm state” (Paff: column 9, lines 35-40, wherein the icon changes color based on the alarm state). However, this apparatus lacks the touch screen as claimed. Thompson teaches that a touch screen allows a user to control a camera (Thompson: column 7, lines 15-22). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the apparatus disclosed by Paff and add the touch screen taught by Thompson in order to provide a user with an efficient and friendly interface for implementing camera controls.

Regarding claims 17-18, Paff discloses “wherein the icon corresponds to a security device coverage area” (Paff: figure 5, wherein the icons are shaped based on the coverage area/volume. Note the dome, camera, window, door, and phone icons).

Regarding claim 19, Paff discloses “when the security device signal is generated, generating an audible alarm” (Paff: column 9, line 66 – column 10, line 2, wherein the audible alarm would be the bells or sirens).

Regarding claim 21, Paff discloses “in response to touching an icon, directing movement of the display” (Paff: column 7, lines 38-41, wherein the touching is clicking on the icon, the directing movement of the display is displaying the video corresponding to the clicked icon).

1. Claims 22-30 and 32-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff (6665004) in view of Thompson (5872594) in further view of Yonezawa et al. (6266082), (hereinafter referred to as “Yonezawa”).

Regarding claim 22, note the examiners rejection for claim 16, and in addition, claim 22 differs from claim 16 in that claim 22 further requires the display being a 3-D display. Yonezawa teaches that prior art display systems do not allow the user to freely rearrange the video (Yonezawa: column 1, lines 47-55). To help alleviate this problem, Yonezawa discloses an apparatus which utilizes “three-dimensional displays” (Yonezawa: figure 8, wherein the 3-D window is window 612). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the 3-D

windows taught by Yonezawa in order to obtain an apparatus that provides the user the ability to easily change the display to adapt to a plurality of different users needs.

Regarding claim 23, Yonezawa discloses “the icon represents a field of view of coverage of the security device” (Yonezawa: figure 8, wherein the icon displays the field of view of coverage of the camera).

Regarding claim 24, Paff discloses “the icon is translucent” (Paff: figures 4-5).

Regarding claim 25, Yonezawa discloses “the display comprises a two-dimensional display” (Yonezawa: figure 8, wherein the 2-D display is the view of the floor plan on the left hand side of the screen).

Regarding claims 26-27, Yonezawa discloses “the icon comprises a 2-D icon on the 2-D display and a 3-D icon on the 3-D display” (Yonezawa: figure 8, wherein the 2-D icon is the picture of the camera 523, the 3-D icon is the picture of the garbage can 632).

Regarding claim 28, Yonezawa discloses “the display comprises a 2-D and 3-D display on separate screens” (Yonezawa: figure 8, wherein the two displays are shown to be separate).

Regarding claim 29, Paff discloses “displaying the icon corresponding to the alarm state by changing color of the icon” (Paff: column 9, lines 35-45).

Regarding claims 30, Paff discloses "displaying the icon by changing a material property of the icon" (Paff: column 9, lines 35-44, wherein the material property is the color).

Regarding claim 32, Paff discloses "displaying an ongoing alarm with the icon" (Paff: column 9, lines 35-44 and 55-60).

Regarding claim 33, Paff discloses "displaying an alarm priority with the icon" (Paff: column 9, lines 35-44, wherein the color corresponds to the priority).

Regarding claim 34, note the examiners rejection for claim 16, and in addition, Paff discloses "displaying past alarm with icon" (Paff: figure 36).

Regarding claim 35, Paff discloses "displaying a tamper status with the icon" (Paff: column 9, lines 35-44 and 55-60, wherein the tamper status is the different states which indicate what area has been tampered with).

Regarding claim 36, Paff discloses "displaying a disconnected state of a security device with the icon" (Paff: column 8, lines 24-27, wherein the disconnected state is displayed by changing colors based on whether the icon is selected or deselected/disconnected from the user's view).

Regarding claim 37, Paff discloses "displaying an acknowledged state with the icon" (Paff: column 8, lines 24-27, wherein the acknowledged state is changing the color to indicate/acknowledge the user correctly selected the icon).

Regarding claim 38, Paff discloses "automatically changing a display comprises flying in a predetermined manner to a predetermined view of the security device" (Paff: column 8, lines 30-40. The examiner notes that by

starting from the initial zoom setting position and increasing the zoom ratio, a flying effect would be seen on the screen by the user).

Regarding claim 39, Paff discloses “generating audio cues” (Paff: column 9, line 66 – column 10, line 2).

2. Claims 40-42 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff (6665004) in view of Thompson (5872594) in further view of Katz (7019770).

Regarding claim 40, note the examiners rejection for claim 16, and in addition, claim 40 differs from claim 16 in that claim 40 further requires the audio cues to be unique to each security device. Katz teaches that unique tones or cues assigned to objects can help determine whether fraudulent activity has taken place (Katz: column 6, lines 58-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the unique audio cues taught by Katz in order to help better determine when fraudulent activities are taking place.

Regarding claim 41, Paff discloses “the audio cues to comprise a human voice” (Paff: column 21, lines 15-29).

Regarding claim 42, Paff discloses automatically sending hardware commands to other devices in response to an alarm” (Paff: column 6, lines 13-17, wherein the processor sends commands to turn the other devices, or VCR, on and off).

Regarding claim 71, note the examiners rejections for claims 16, 22, and 23.



3. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff (6665004) in view of Thompson (5872594) in further view of Hobson et al. (6317152), (hereinafter referred to as "Hobson").

Regarding claim 43, note the examiners rejection for claim 16, and in addition, claim 43 differs from claim 16 in that claim 43 further requires a digital video recorder. Hobson teaches that prior art recording systems may lose vital information (Hobson: column 3, lines 38-40). To help alleviate this problem, Hobson discloses "a digital video recorder" (Hobson: column 3, lines 42-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the digital video recorder taught by Hobson in order to obtain an apparatus that prevents the loss of vital information.

4. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff (6665004) in view of Thompson (5872594) in further view of Yonezawa et al. (6266082), (hereinafter referred to as "Yonezawa") in further view of Box (7194426).

Regarding claim 31, note the examiners rejection for claim 22, and in addition, claim 31 differs from claim 22 in that claim 31 further requires changing the animation of the icon. Box teaches the use of animated icons within security applications (Box: column 7, lines 59-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the animated icon taught by Box in order to easily indicate a changed state to a user).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID CZEKAJ whose telephone number is (571)272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dave Czekaj/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2621